

Iitaka-Severi's Conjecture for Complex Threefolds

Gerd Dethloff

Abstract

We prove the following generalization of Severi's Theorem:
Let X be a fixed complex variety. Then there exist, up to birational equivalence, only finitely many complex varieties Y of general type of dimension at most three which admit a dominant rational map $f : X \rightarrow Y$.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Some Tools from the Theory of 3-folds	5
3	Bounding the Index of a Dominated Canonical 3-fold	8

1 Introduction

Let X and Y be algebraic varieties, i.e. complete integral schemes over a field of characteristic zero, and denote by $R(X, Y)$ the set of all dominant rational maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$. Moreover denote by $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(X)$ the set $\{f : X \rightarrow Y \mid f \text{ is a dominant rational map onto an algebraic variety } Y \text{ of general type}\}$ and by $\mathcal{F}_m = \mathcal{F}_m(X)$ the set $\{f : X \rightarrow Y \mid f \text{ is a dominant rational map and } Y \text{ is birationally equivalent to a nonsingular algebraic variety for which the } m\text{-th pluricanonical mapping is birational onto its image}\}$. We introduce an equivalence relation $\sim$ on the sets $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}_m$ as follows: $(f : X \rightarrow Y) \sim (f_1 : X \rightarrow Y_1)$ iff there exists a birational map $b : Y \rightarrow Y_1$ such that $b \circ f = f_1$.

The classical theorem of Severi can be stated as follows (cf.[30]):

Theorem 1.1 *For a fixed algebraic variety X there exist only finitely many hyperbolic Riemann surfaces Y such that $R(X, Y)$ is nonempty.*

We may ask if a finiteness theorem of this kind also can be true in higher dimensions. This leads to the following:

Conjecture 1.2 *For a fixed variety X there exist, up to birational equivalence, only finitely many varieties Y of general type such that $R(X, Y)$ is nonempty. Moreover, the set $\mathcal{F}/\sim$ is a finite set.*

Maehara calls this conjecture Iitaka's Conjecture based on Severi's theorem (cf. [24]), and we abbreviate this as Iitaka-Severi's Conjecture. In [24] Maehara states the Conjecture more generally for algebraic varieties (over any field) and separable dominant rational maps. He also mentioned that K. Ueno proposed that a variety of general type could be replaced by a polarized non uniruled variety in this Conjecture.

Maehara proved in Proposition 6.5. in [23] that in characteristic zero the Conjecture is true if one restricts the image varieties Y to such varieties that can be birationally embedded by the m -th pluricanonical map for any given m , i.e. $\mathcal{F}_m/\sim$ is finite for all m . This especially proves the Conjecture for surfaces Y (take $m = 5$). Furthermore Maehara shows that one can find a fixed m such that for all **smooth** varieties Y which have nef and big canonical bundle the m -th pluricanonical map is a birational embedding, which proves the Conjecture also in this case. Earlier Deschamps and Menegaux [6], [7] proved, in characteristic zero, the cases where the varieties Y are surfaces which satisfy $q > 0$ and $P_g \geq 2$, or where the maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$ are morphisms. In this direction Maehara [22] also showed finiteness of isomorphism classes of smooth varieties with ample canonical bundles which are dominated by surjective morphisms from a fixed variety.

There is a related classical result due to de Franchis [11] which states that for any Riemann surface X and any fixed hyperbolic Riemann surface Y the set $R(X, Y)$ is finite. At the same time he gives an upper bound for $\#R(X, Y)$ only in terms of X . The generalization of this theorem to higher dimensions is not a conjecture any more: Kobayashi and Ochiai [19] proved that if X is a Moisheson space and Y a compact complex space of general type, then the set of surjective meromorphic maps from X to Y is finite. Deschamps and Menegaux [5] proved that if X and Y are smooth projective varieties over a field of arbitrary characteristic, and Y is of general type, then $\#R(X, Y)$ is finite (where one has additionally to assume that the dominant rational maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$ are separable).

From these results it follows that the second part of Conjecture 1.2 is a consequence of the first part, hence we only have to deal with the first part.

Bandman [1], [2] and Bandman and Markushevich [3] also generalized the second part of de Franchis' theorem, proving that for projective varieties X and Y with only canonical singularities and nef and big canonical line bundles K_X and K_Y the number $\#R(X, Y)$ can be bounded in terms of invariants of X and the index of Y .

Another generalization of the (first part of) de Franchis' theorem was given by

Noguchi [27], who proved that there are only finitely many surjective meromorphic mappings from a Zariski open subset X of an irreducible compact complex space onto an irreducible compact hyperbolic complex space Y . Suzuki [31] generalized this result to the case where X and Y are Zariski open subsets of irreducible compact complex spaces $\overline{X}$ and $\overline{Y}$ and Y is hyperbolically embedded in $\overline{Y}$. These results can be generalized to finiteness results for nontrivial sections in hyperbolic fiber spaces. But since a more precise discussion would lead us too far from the proper theme of this paper, we refer the interested reader to Noguchi [27] and Suzuki [31], or to the survey [33] of Zaidenberg-Lin, where he also can find an overview for earlier results which generalized de Franchis' theorem.

It is a natural question if Conjecture 1.2 can also be stated in terms of complex spaces. In [27] Noguchi proposed the following:

Conjecture 1.3 *Let X be a Zariski open subset of an irreducible compact complex space. Then the set of compact irreducible hyperbolic complex spaces Y which admit a dominant meromorphic map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is finite.*

Let us now return to Conjecture 1.2. In this paper we are only interested in the case of complex varieties. Since we want to prove finiteness only up to birational equivalence, we may assume without loss of generality that X and all Y in the Conjecture are nonsingular projective complex varieties, by virtue of Hironaka's resolution theorem [15], cf. also [32], p.73. Now fix a complex projective variety X . We define $\mathcal{G}_m := \{ \text{a nonsingular complex projective variety } Y : \text{the } m\text{-th pluricanonical map } \Phi_m : Y \rightarrow \Phi_m(Y) \text{ is birational onto its image and there exists a dominant rational map } f : X \rightarrow Y \}$. In order to show Conjecture 1.2 it is sufficient, by Proposition 6.5. of Maehara [23], to show the following

Conjecture 1.4 *There exists a natural number m only depending on X such that all smooth complex projective varieties Y of general type which admit a dominant rational map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ belong to $\mathcal{G}_m$.*

We will prove that Conjecture 1.4 is true for varieties Y which are of dimension three, thus we prove Iitaka-Severi's Conjecture for complex 3-folds. Since for varieties Y of dimension one resp. two we can take $m = 3$ resp. $m = 5$, our main theorem is:

Theorem 1.5 *Let X be a fixed complex variety. Then there exist, up to birational equivalence, only finitely many complex varieties Y of general type of dimension at most three which admit a dominant rational map $f : X \rightarrow Y$. Moreover the set $\mathcal{F} / \sim$ is a finite set if one restricts to complex varieties Y of dimension at most three .*

As Maehara [24], p.167 pointed out already, in order to prove Conjecture 1.4 it is enough to show that for all varieties Y there exists a minimal model and the index of these minimal models can be uniformly bounded from above by a constant only depending on X . Since in dimension three minimal models and even canonical models do exist, the problem is reduced to the question how to bound the index.

But it turns out that one is running into problems if one directly tries to bound the indices of the canonical models Y_c of threefolds Y , only using that they are all dominated by dominant rational maps from a fixed variety X . So we will proceed in a different way:

The first step of the proof is to show that the Euler characteristic $\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is uniformly bounded by an entire constant C depending only on X (Proposition 3.2), that is how we use the fact that all threefolds Y are dominated by a fixed variety X .

In the second step of the proof, we show that we can choose another entire constant R , also only depending on X , such that for any threefold Y of general type for which the Euler characteristic is bounded by C the following holds (Proposition 3.3): Either the index of the canonical model Y_c of Y divides R (first case) or the pluricanonical sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{Y_c}((13C)K_{Y_c})$ has two linearly independent sections on Y_c (second case). In order to prove this Proposition, we use the Plurigenus Formula due to Barlow, Fletcher and Reid and estimates of some terms in this formula due to Fletcher. In the first case the index is bounded, and we are done (Proposition 2.8).

The third step of the proof deals with the second case. Here we remark that the two linearly independent sections on Y_c can be lifted to sections in $H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(mK_Y))$, and then we can apply a theorem of Kollar [20] which states that now the $(11m + 5)$ -th pluricanonical map gives a birational embedding (Proposition 3.4), and we are also done in the second case.

Hence we do not prove directly that under our assumptions the index is uniformly bounded, we prove that if it is not, then there is some other way to show that some fixed pluricanonical map gives a birational embedding. The fact that the index actually has such a uniform bound then follows as a result of Theorem 1.5.

It finally might be worth while to point out that the second and the third step of our proof actually yield:

Theorem 1.6 *Let C be a positive entire constant. Define $R = \text{lcm}(2, 3, \dots, 26C - 1)$ and $m = \text{lcm}(18R + 1, 143C + 5)$. Then for all smooth projective 3-folds of general type for which the Euler characteristic is bounded above by C the m -th pluricanonical map is birational onto its image.*

Despite the fact that our $m = m(C)$ is explicit, it is so huge that it is only of theoretical interest. For example for $C = 1$ it is known by Fletcher [12] that one can choose

$m = 269$, but for $C = 1$ our m is already for of the size 10^{12} . Moreover J.P. Demailly recently told me that he conjectures that for 3-folds of general type any $m \geq 7$ should work, independantly of the size of the Euler characteristic.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we collect, for the convenience of the reader and also for fixing the notations, the basic facts from canonical three-folds which we need. We try to give precise references to all these facts, but do not try to trace these facts back to the original papers. Where we could not find such references we give short proofs. However we expect that all these facts should be standard to specialists on threefolds. In section 3 we give the proof of Theorem 1.5.

The author would like to thank S.Kosarew (Grenoble) for pointing out Noguchi's Conjecture 1.3 to him. This was his starting point for working on problems of this kind. He would also like to thank F.Catanese (Pisa) for pointing out Fletcher's paper [12] to him, since this paper later gave him the motivation for the key step in the proof of Theorem 1.5. He finally would like to thank the Institut Fourier in Grenoble, the University of Pisa and the organizers of the conference Geometric Complex Analysis in Hayama for inviting him, since this gave him the possibility to discuss with many specialists.

2 Some Tools from the Theory of 3-folds

Let Y be a normal complex variety of dimension n , Y_{reg} the subspace of regular points of Y and $j : Y_{reg} \hookrightarrow Y$ the inclusion map. Then the sheaves $\mathcal{O}_Y(mK_Y)$ are defined as

$$\mathcal{O}_Y(mK_Y) := j_*((\Omega_{Y_{reg}}^n)^{\otimes m})$$

Equivalently $\mathcal{O}_Y(mK_Y)$ can be defined as the sheaf of m -fold tensor products of rational canonical differentials on Y which are regular on Y_{reg} . The mK_Y can be considered as Weil divisors. For this and the following definitions, cf. [29] and [25].

Definition 2.1 *Y has only **canonical** singularities if it satisfies the following two conditions:*

- i) for some integer $r \geq 1$, the Weil divisor rK_Y is a Cartier divisor.*
- ii) if $f : \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$ is a resolution of Y and $\{E_i\}$ the family of all exceptional prime divisors of f , then*

$$rK_{\tilde{Y}} = f^*(rK_Y) + \sum a_i E_i$$

with $a_i \geq 0$.

*If $a_i > 0$ for every exceptional divisor E_i , then Y has only **terminal** singularities.*

The smallest integer r for which the Weil divisor rK_Y is Cartier is called the **index** of Y .

Definition 2.2 A complex projective algebraic variety Y with only canonical (resp. terminal) singularities is called a **canonical** (resp. **minimal**) model if K_Y is an ample (resp. a nef) $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor.

We say that a variety Z has a **canonical** (resp. **minimal**) **model** if there exists a canonical (resp. minimal) model which is birational to Z .

Later on we will need the following theorem due to Elkik [8] and Flenner [10], 1.3 (cf. [29], p.363):

Theorem 2.3 Canonical singularities are rational singularities.

The first part of the following theorem, which is of high importance for the theory of 3-folds, was proved by Mori [26], the second part follows from the first part by works of Fujita [13], Benveniste [4] and Kawamata [17]:

Theorem 2.4 Let Y be a non singular projective 3-fold of general type.

i) There exists a minimal model of Y .

ii) There exists a unique canonical model of Y , the canonical ring $R(Y, K_Y)$ of Y is finitely generated, and the canonical model is just $\text{Proj} R(Y, K_Y)$.

We have the following Plurigenus Formula due to Barlow, Fletcher and Reid (cf. [12], [29], see also [21], p.666 for the last part):

Theorem 2.5 Let Y be a projective 3-fold with only canonical singularities. Then we have

$$\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(mK_Y)) = \frac{1}{12}(2m-1)m(m-1)K_Y^3 - (2m-1)\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) + \sum_Q l(Q, m)$$

with

$$l(Q, m) = \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \frac{\overline{bk}(r - \overline{bk})}{2r}$$

Here the summation takes place over a basket of singularities Q of type $\frac{1}{r}(a, -a, 1)$ (see below for these notations). $\overline{j}$ denotes the smallest nonnegative residue of j modulo r , and b is chosen such that $\overline{ab} = 1$.

Furthermore we have

$$\text{index}(Y) = \text{lcm}\{r = r(Q) : Q \in \text{basket}\}$$

A singularity of type $\frac{1}{r}(a, -a, 1)$ is a cyclic quotient singularity $\mathcal{C}^3/\mu_r$, where μ_r denotes the cyclic group of r th roots of unity in $\mathcal{C}$, and μ_r acts on $\mathcal{C}^3$ via

$$\mu_r \ni \epsilon : (z_1, z_2, z_3) \rightarrow (\epsilon^a z_1, \epsilon^{-a} z_2, \epsilon z_3)$$

Reid introduced the term ‘basket of singularities’ in order to point out that the singularities Q of the basket are not necessarily singularities of Y , but only ‘fictitious singularities’. However the singularities of Y make the same contribution to $\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(mK_Y))$ as if they were those of the basket, hence we also can work with the singularities of the basket, which have the advantage that their contributions are usually easier than those of the original singularities. More precisely, one can pass from Y to a variety where the singularities of the basket actually occur by a crepant partial resolution of singularities and then by a flat deformation. For the details cf. [29], p.404, 412.

For estimating from below the terms $l(Q, m)$ in the Plurigenus Formula, we will need two Propositions due to Fletcher [12]. In those Propositions $[s]$ denotes the integral part of $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 2.6

$$l\left(\frac{1}{r}(1, -1, 1), m\right) = \frac{\overline{m}(\overline{m} - 1)(3r + 1 - 2\overline{m})}{12r} + \frac{r^2 - 1}{12} \left[\frac{m}{r}\right]$$

Proposition 2.7 *For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha$ and for all $m \leq [(\alpha + 1)/2]$, we have:*

$$l\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}(a, -a, 1), m\right) \geq l\left(\frac{1}{\beta}(1, -1, 1), m\right)$$

At last, we want to give a proof for Maehara’s remark [24], p.167 which we already mentioned, namely that it is enough to show that the index of the canonical models of the varieties Y can be uniformly bounded from above by a constant only depending on X . We prove more precisely:

Proposition 2.8 *Let Y be a smooth projective 3-fold of general type and l a natural number such that l is an integer multiple of the index r of the canonical model Y_c of Y . Then the $(18l + 1)$ -th pluricanonical map is birational onto its image.*

Proof: We could pass from the canonical model Y_c of Y to a minimal model Y_m and then apply Corollary 4.6 of the preprint [9] of Ein, Küchle and Lazarsfeld. But since it might even be easier we want to pass directly from Y_c to Y , and then apply

the corresponding result of Ein, Küchle and Lazarsfeld for smooth projective 3-folds, namely Corollary 3. of [9].

Since l is a multiple of the index of Y_c , lK_{Y_c} is an ample line bundle. Since we only are interested in Y up to birational equivalence we may assume that $\pi : Y \rightarrow Y_c$ is a desingularization. Since the bundle lK_{Y_c} on Y_c is ample, the pulled back bundle $\pi^*(lK_{Y_c})$ on Y is still nef and big. Hence we can apply Corollary 3. of [9] to this bundle and get that the map obtained by the sections of the bundle $K_Y + 18\pi^*(lK_{Y_c})$ maps Y birationally onto its image. But since by the Definition 2.1 of canonical singularities every section of the bundle $K_Y + 18\pi^*(lK_{Y_c})$ is also a section of $K_Y + 18lK_Y = (1 + 18l)K_Y$, the claim follows. $\square$

Remark: Notice that for Proposition 2.8 we do not need the assumption that the smooth projective 3-folds Y are dominated by a fixed complex variety X . This only will be needed to bound the indices of the canonical models Y_c of the Y .

3 Bounding the Index of a Dominated Canonical 3-fold

In order to prove Theorem 1.5, it is enough to prove the following

Theorem 3.1 *Let X be a fixed smooth complex variety. Then there exists a natural number m depending only on X such that all smooth complex projective 3-folds Y of general type which admit a dominant rational map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ belong to $\mathcal{G}_m$.*

Here, as in the introduction, $\mathcal{G}_m$ is defined as $\mathcal{G}_m := \{ \text{a nonsingular complex projective variety } Y : \text{the } m\text{-th pluricanonical map } \Phi_m : Y \rightarrow \Phi_m(Y) \text{ is birational onto its image and there exists a dominant rational map } f : X \rightarrow Y \}$.

The rest of this chapter is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.1. We denote by Y_c the canonical model of Y . Furthermore we may assume without loss of generality that $\pi : Y \rightarrow Y_c$ is a desingularization (since we only need to look at those smooth projective varieties Y up to birational equivalence).

In the first step of the proof we show:

Proposition 3.2 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 there exists an entire constant $C \geq 1$ only depending on X , such that for all Y we have $\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = \chi(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}) \leq C$.*

Proof: First we get by Hodge theory on compact Kähler manifolds (cf. [14], or [16], p.199):

$$h^i(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = h^0(Y, \Omega_Y^i), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3$$

Now by Theorem 5.3. in Iitaka's book [16], p.198 we get that

$$h^0(Y, \Omega_Y^i) \leq h^0(X, \Omega_X^i), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3$$

Hence by the triangle inequality we get a constant C , only depending on X , such that

$$|\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)| \leq C$$

Now by the theorem of Elkik and Flenner (Theorem 2.3) Y_c has only rational singularities, hence by degeneration of the Leray spectral sequence we get that

$$\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = \chi(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c})$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 3.2. □

In the second step of the proof of Theorem 3.1 we show:

Proposition 3.3 *Let $C \geq 1$ be an entire constant, $R := \text{lcm}(2, 3, \dots, 26C - 1)$ and $m_1 = 18R + 1$. Then for all smooth projective complex 3-folds Y of general type with $\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) \leq C$ we have either $Y \in \mathcal{G}_{m_1}$ or $h^0(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}((13C)K_{Y_c})) \geq 2$.*

Proof: We distinguish between two cases: The first case is that the index of Y_c divides R . Then applying Proposition 2.8 we get that $Y \in \mathcal{G}_{m_1}$ and we are done. The second case is that the index does not divide R . Then in the Plurigenus Formula Theorem 2.5 of Barlow, Fletcher and Reid we necessarily have at least one singularity $\tilde{Q}$ in the basket of singularities which is of the type $\frac{1}{r}(a, -a, 1)$ with $r \geq 26C$. Now applying first a vanishing theorem for ample sheaves (cf. Theorem 4.1 in [12]), the fact that $K_{Y_c}^3 > 0$ (since K_{Y_c} is an ample $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor) and then the Propositions 2.6 and 2.7 due to Fletcher, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & h^0(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}((13C)K_{Y_c})) \\ &= \chi(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}((13C)K_{Y_c})) \\ &\geq (1 - 26C)\chi(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}) + \sum_{Q \in \text{basket}} l(Q, 13C) \\ &\geq (1 - 26C)C + l(\tilde{Q}, 13C) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq (1 - 26C)C + l\left(\frac{1}{26C}(1, -1, 1), 13C\right) \\
&= (1 - 26C)C + \frac{13C(13C - 1)(78C + 1 - 26C)}{312C} \\
&= \frac{312C^2 - 8112C^3 + 8788C^3 - 507C^2 - 13C}{312C} \\
&= \frac{52C^2 - 15C - 1}{24} \\
&\geq \frac{36}{24} = 1.5
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is true since $C \geq 1$. Since $h^0(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}((13C)K_{Y_c}))$ is an entire, this finishes the proof of Proposition 3.3. $\square$

In the third step of the proof of Theorem 3.1 we show:

Proposition 3.4 *Assume that for a smooth projective complex 3-fold Y of general type we have $h^0(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}((13C)K_{Y_c})) \geq 2$. Then $Y \in \mathcal{G}_{m_2}$ with $m_2 = 143C + 5$.*

Proof: Kollar proved that if $h^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(lK_Y)) \geq 2$ then the $(11l+5)$ -th pluricanonical map is birational onto its image (Corollary 4.8 in [20]). So the only thing which remains to prove is that from $h^0(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}((13C)K_{Y_c})) \geq 2$ we get $h^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y((13C)K_Y)) \geq 2$. This fact is standard for experts (cf. e.g. [28], p.277, or [12], p.225), but since we remarked in talks about this paper that this fact doesn't seem to be generally well known, we want to indicate how one can prove it:

What we have to prove is that taking linearly independant sections s_1, s_2 from $H^0(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}(lK_{Y_c}))$ we can get from them linearly independant sections t_1, t_2 from $H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(lK_Y))$. We mentioned at the beginning of section 1 that $\mathcal{O}_{Y_c}(lK_{Y_c})$ can also be defined as the sheaf of l -fold tensor products of rational canonical differentials on Y_c which are regular on $(Y_c)_{reg}$. But since Y and Y_c are birationally equivalent, from this definition it is immediate that any linearly independant sections s_1, s_2 from $H^0(Y_c, \mathcal{O}_{Y_c}(lK_{Y_c}))$ can be lifted, namely as pull backs of (tensor products of rational) canonical differentials with the holomorphic map π , to linearly independant **rational** sections t_1, t_2 of the bundle $\mathcal{O}_Y(lK_Y)$. These lifted sections are regular outside the family of the exceptional prime divisors $\{E_i\}$ of the resolution $\pi : Y \rightarrow Y_c$. We have to show that t_1 and t_2 are regular everywhere. Since Y is a manifold, by the First Riemann Extension Theorem it is sufficient to show that these sections are bounded near points of the $\{E_i\}$. In order to show this, choose a natural number p , which now may depend on Y , such that $\text{index}(Y_c)$ divides pl . Then by the definition of canonical singularities (Definition 2.1) the sections s_1^p and s_2^p lift to **regular** sections t_1^p and t_2^p . Hence t_1 and t_2 have to be bounded near points of the $\{E_i\}$, and we are done. $\square$

Now the proof of Theorem 3.1 is immediate: If we take $m_0 := \text{lcm}(m_1, m_2)$, then by Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.4 we have $Y \in \mathcal{G}_{m_0}$ for all Y which occur in Theorem 3.1. $\square$

References

- [1] T. Bandman, *Surjective holomorphic mappings of projective manifolds*, Siberian Math. J. **22** (1982), 204–210.
- [2] T. Bandman, *Topological invariants of a variety and the number of its holomorphic mappings*, in: J. Noguchi (Ed.) Proceedings of the International Symposium Holomorphic Mappings, Diophantine Geometry and Related Topics, 188-202. RIMS, Kyoto University, 1992.
- [3] T. Bandman and D. Markushevich, *On the Number of Rational Maps Between Varieties of General Type*, Preprint, 10 pages.
- [4] X. Benveniste, *Sur l'anneau canonique de certaine variété de dimension 3*, Invent. Math **73** (1983), 157-164.
- [5] M.M. Deschamps and R.L. Menegaux, *Applications rationnelles séparables dominantes sur une variété de type général*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **106** (1978), 279-287.
- [6] M.M. Deschamps and R.L. Menegaux, *Surfaces de type général dominées par une variété fixe*, C.R.Acad.Sc.Paris Ser.A **288** (1979), 765-767.
- [7] M.M. Deschamps and R.L. Menegaux, *Surfaces de type général dominées par une variété fixe II*, C.R.Acad.Sc.Paris Ser.A **291** (1980), 587-590.
- [8] R. Elkik, *Rationalité des singularités canoniques*, Invent. Math **64** (1981), 1-6.
- [9] L. Ein, O. Küchle and R. Lazarsfeld, *Local Positivity of Ample Line Bundles*, Preprint, 23 pages.
- [10] H. Flenner, *Rational singularities*, Arch. Math. **36** (1981), 35-44.
- [11] M. de Franchis, *Un Teorema sulle involuzioni irrazionali.*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo **36** (1913), 368.

- [12] A.R. Fletcher, *Contributions to Riemann-Roch on projective 3-folds with only canonical singularities and applications*, in: S.J. Bloch (Ed.) *Algebraic Geometry*, Bowdoin 1985, 221-231. Proc Symp. in Pure Math. **46**, 1987.
- [13] T. Fujita, *Zariski decomposition and canonical rings of elliptic threefolds*, J. Math. Japan **38** (1986), 20-37.
- [14] P. Griffiths and J. Harris, *Principles of Algebraic Geometry*. John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- [15] H. Hironaka, *Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero I*, Ann. Math. **79** (1964), 109-326.
- [16] S. Iitaka, *Algebraic Geometry*. Springer, 1982.
- [17] Y. Kawamata, *On the finiteness of generators of pluricanonical ring for a 3-fold of general type*, Amer. J. Math. **106** (1984), 1503-1512.
- [18] Y. Kawamata, K. Matsuda and K. Matsuki, *Introduction to the Minimal Model Problem*, in: T. Oda (Ed.) *Algebraic Geometry*, Sendai 1985, 283-360. Advanced Studies in Pure Math. **10**, 1987.
- [19] S. Kobayashi and T. Ochiai, *Meromorphic Mappings onto Compact Complex Spaces of General Type*, Invent. Math. **31** (1975), 7-16.
- [20] J. Kollar, *Higher direct images of dualizing sheaves I*, Annals of Math. **123** (1986), 11-42.
- [21] J. Kollar and S. Mori, *Classification of three-dimensional flips*, J. of the AMS **5** (1992), 533-703.
- [22] K. Maehara, *Families of Varieties dominated by a variety*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A **55** (1979), 146-151.
- [23] K. Maehara *A Finiteness Property of Varieties of General Type*, Math. Ann. **262** (1983), 101-123.
- [24] K. Maehara, *Diophantine problem of algebraic varieties and Hodge theory*, in: J. Noguchi (Ed.) *Proceedings of the International Symposium Holomorphic Mappings, Diophantine Geometry and Related Topics*, 167-187. RIMS, Kyoto University, 1992.
- [25] S. Mori, *Classification of Higher -Dimensional Varieties*, in: S.J. Bloch (Ed.) *Algebraic Geometry*, Bowdoin 1985, 269-331. Proc Symp. in Pure Math. **46**, 1987.

- [26] S. Mori, *Flip Theorem and the Existence of Minimal Models for 3-folds*, J. AMS **1** (1988), 117-253.
- [27] J. Noguchi *Meromorphic Mappings into Compact Hyperbolic Complex Spaces and Geometric Diophantine Problems*, Internatl. J. Math. **3** (1992), 277-289, 677.
- [28] M. Reid, *Canonical 3-folds*, in A. Beauville (Ed.) Algebraic Geometry, Angers 1979, 273-310. Sijthoff and Noordhoff, 1980.
- [29] M. Reid, *Young person's guide to canonical singularities*, in: S.J. Bloch (Ed.) Algebraic Geometry, Bowdoin 1985, 345-414. Proc Symp. in Pure Math. **46**, 1987.
- [30] P. Samuel, *Complements a un article de Hans Grauert sur la conjecture de Mordell*, Publ. Math. IHES **29** (1966), 311-318.
- [31] M. Suzuki, *Moduli spaces of holomorphic mappings into hyperbolically embedded complex spaces and hyperbolic fibre spaces*, in: J. Noguchi (Ed.) Proceedings of the International Symposium Holomorphic Mappings, Diophantine Geometry and Related Topics, 157-166. RIMS, Kyoto University, 1992.
- [32] K. Ueno, *Classification Theory of Algebraic Varieties and Compact Complex Spaces*, LNM **439**. Springer, 1975.
- [33] M.G. Zaidenberg and V.Ya. Lin, *Finiteness theorems for holomorphic maps, Several Complex Variables III*, Encyclopaedia Math. Sciences **9**, 113-172. Springer, 1989.

Gerd Dethloff, Mathematisches Institut der Universität Göttingen, Bunsenstraße 3-5,
 37073 Göttingen, Germany
 e-mail: DETHLOFF@CFGAUSS.UNI-MATH.GWDG.DE